



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/814,832

03/31/2004

Hermann Lueckhoff

13906-164001

6486

32864 7590 05/05/2009

FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.

PO BOX 1022

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2444

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/05/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/814,832	Applicant(s) LUECKHOFF, HERMANN	
	Examiner PELING A. SHAW	Art Unit 2444	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PELING A. SHAW. (3) ____.

(2) J. Richard Soderberg (reg. no. 43,352). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Arora et al. (US 20040064512 A1) and Chandra et al. (US 7130885 B2).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant has discussed and agreed on 101 and 112 issues. Applicant has further discussed the claim rejections under 102 and 103(a). Examiner agrees that the proposed amendment seems to clarify the claimed invention against the cited prior arts. Examiner would review the claim rejections upon an response from the applicant.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Peling A Shaw/ Examiner, Art Unit 2444	
--	--